

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

THIRD APPELLATE DISTRICT

(Sacramento)

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

VANESSA JUNE JENNINGS,

Defendant and Appellant.

C071784

(Super. Ct. No. 12F03291)

This case comes to us pursuant to *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436 (*Wende*). Having reviewed the record as required by *Wende*, we affirm the judgment. We provide the following brief description of the facts and procedural history of the case. (See *People v. Kelly* (2006) 40 Cal.4th 106, 110, 124.)

In May 2012 defendant Vanessa June Jennings went into the Total Fashion clothing store and started concealing merchandise. When she was confronted by the owners of the store, she punched them in the face and fled. She was apprehended nearby with a stolen blouse. Defendant was charged with second degree robbery. (Pen. Code, § 211.)

Defendant pleaded no contest to second degree robbery in exchange for a stipulated sentence of two years in state prison. She was sentenced in accordance with the plea to the low term of two years and awarded 56 days of presentence custody credits. A restitution fund fine of \$480 was imposed, as well as a \$30 criminal conviction fee and a \$40 court operation assessment. Jail booking and classification fees were waived. Defendant's request for a certificate of probable cause was denied.

Appointed counsel filed an opening brief setting forth the facts of the case and requesting this court review the record and determine whether there are any arguable issues on appeal. (*Wende, supra*, 25 Cal.3d 436.) Defendant was advised by counsel of the right to file a supplemental brief within 30 days of the date of filing of the opening brief. More than 30 days elapsed, and we received no communication from defendant. Having undertaken an examination of the entire record, we find no arguable error that would result in a disposition more favorable to defendant.

DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed.

RAYE, P. J.

We concur:

HULL, J.

MAURO, J.